REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17 and 19 have been amended to correct formality errors and to more clearly define the invention.

The claims have been amended to more clearly recite that the claimed systems involve "mapping" a "first identifier code associated" with a "first entity to a corresponding second identifier code" identifying "the object" and the second identifier code is associated with a second entity different to the first entity and other features. Support for this and the other amendments is found in the existing claims and in the Application description on page 2 lines 15-17 and in connection with Figures 3 and 9 and in other places.

I. Rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 112.

Dependent claim10 is rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, claim 10 is rejected for lack of antecedent basis for the term "said rules".

Claim 10 is amended to be dependent on claim 9 which provides antecedent basis for "said rules". Consequently this ground of objection is no longer deemed to apply and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,418,441 – Call1. These claims, as amended, are deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Amended claim 1 recites a method for "determining a specific identifier code for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes by a corresponding plurality of entities" involving "receiving a first message including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity; extracting said first identifier code from said received first message; generating a second message incorporating said extracted first identifier code, said second message being for initiating a search of an identifier code database mapping said first identifier code associated with said first entity to a corresponding

second identifier code identifying said object, said second identifier code being associated with a second entity different to said first entity; receiving said second identifier code corresponding to said first identifier code in response to communicating said second message for initiating a search of said identifier code database". These features are not shown (or suggested) in Call1.

The method of amended claim 1 dynamically translates a code or identifier used by of a first entity (such as a first company) to identify an object such as a product, service or resource, to a corresponding code or identifier used by another entity (such as a second company) using one or more code mapping databases (Application page 2 lines 15-17). Specifically, the method involves "receiving a first message" including "a first identifier code" associated "with a first entity" and "identifying an object" and "generating a second message" incorporating an "extracted first identifier code...for initiating a search of an identifier code database mapping said first identifier code associated with said first entity to a corresponding second identifier code identifying said object" and "associated with a second entity different to said first entity" and "receiving the second identifier code". The system addresses the problems involved in effecting commercial transactions that arise through attempted integration of disparate computer systems where a retailer, one or more distributors and a manufacturer employ different identifier codes for the same part, for example (Application page 1 lines 15-30). The claimed system "alleviates the need to manually synchronize different identifier code mapping databases and files" (Application page 6 lines 17-19).

The "product code translator" of the system of Call1 performs "a translation of specified universal product codes into the corresponding **Internet addresses** from which information about the designated products can be obtained. The product code translator 101 stores cross-references between product codes and **Internet addresses**" (Call1 column 4 lines 29-36). Further Call1 defines the term "Internet address" as being "used to refer to the all, or a significant part of, a reference to a resource on the Internet. Such a reference may take the form of a numerical IP address or an alphanumeric Uniform Resource Locator (" URL") which may identify a file on a specified machine, a database query, a specific command output, or some other accessible Internet resource. Thus, the term ""Internet address" includes such things as a specific 32-bit address of a specific computer connected to the Internet, written in decimal as "" 123.040.212.002"; a domain name such as " " patentsoft.com" which can be resolved into a numerical IP-address using a domain name server; the URL of a file accessible via the Internet, a URL identifying a query processing script

with passed parameters, or an email address such as "847563@; manufacturer.com" (Call1 column 5 lines 14-28). An "Internet Address" as used in Call1 is NOT (and does not suggest) an object or product identification code. Call1 does NOT acquire a "second identifier code" by "extracting" a "first identifier code" associated "with a first entity" and "identifying an **object**" from a "first message" and "generating a second message" incorporating the "extracted first identifier code...for initiating a search of an identifier code **database mapping** said **first identifier code** associated with said first entity to a corresponding **second identifier code** identifying **said object**".

The system of claim 1 involves translating a "first identifier code" identifying "an **object**" to a "**second identifier code** identifying" **the same "object".** In contrast, Call1 performs "a translation of specified universal product codes" into "corresponding **Internet addresses"** (Call1 column 4 lines 29-36). The call1 system does NOT show or suggest translating a first identification code of a particular product into a corresponding second identification code of the particular product at all. Call1 is concerned with transfer of "a request for **information**" (such as product description information) specified "by an identifier, such as a product code, to a preferred source of that information, such as an Internet information resource devoted to the product specified by the product code which is created and maintained by the product's manufacturer" (Call1 column 1 lines 59-64). Call1 does NOT address the problems involved in effecting commercial transactions that arise through attempted integration of disparate computer systems where a retailer, one or more distributors and a manufacturer employ different identifier codes for the same part, for example (Application page 1 lines 15-30). Call1 also does NOT address alleviating "the need to manually synchronize different identifier code mapping databases and files" (Application page 6 lines 17-19). Consequently, there is no motivation or other reason in Call1 for incorporating the claimed features.

Call1 does not show or suggest use of a "database mapping" a "first identifier code" identifying "an **object**" to a "**second identifier code** identifying" **the same "object".** The Call1 database shown in Figure 2 and described in Call1 column 6 line 56 to column 9 line 49 include in the "Company-ID field...two fields, FromCode and ThruCode, in a row in cross-reference table **215**. These fields specify a range of one or more consecutive universal product codes" (Call1 column 7 lines 5-8). Further, "the FromCode field" specifies "the lowest valued universal product code cross-referenced to the corresponding **IP address**" and the "ThruCode field" specifies "the highest valued universal product code cross-referenced to that **IP address**". The

database arrangement of Figure 2 enables "a single manufacturer having a single assigned Company-ID value to store information about **different products** designated by different sets of its universal product codes on different Internet servers, or to cross-reference non-continuous sets of universal product codes to the same or different servers. Note further that a manufacturer need not cross-reference all of its available assigned universal product codes, but may omit unused codes or codes designating products for which no information is to be made-available" (Call1 column 7 lines 5-40). Consequently, the from and thru codes shown in the Figure 2 database of Call1 are used to link "different products" with **information** on the products available at IP addresses. Therefore, Call1 does not show or suggest use of a "database mapping" a "first identifier code" identifying "an **object**" to a "**second identifier code** identifying" **the same "object".** Consequently withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 2 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) "said second message initiates a **remote procedure** for mapping said first identifier code to a corresponding second identifier code". As previously explained the Call1 system does NOT show, suggest or concern translating a first identification code of a particular product into a corresponding second identification code of the particular product at all.

Amended dependent claim 4 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 4 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 1 together with "communicating said second message to an **application** useable for initiating a search of said identifier code database". As previously explained, Call1 does not show or suggest use of a "database mapping" a "first identifier code" identifying "an **object**" to a "**second identifier code** identifying" **the same "object".**

Amended dependent claim 7 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 7 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) "extracting said first identifier code and a corresponding third identifier code identifying said object from said received first message, and said generating step generates a second message incorporating said extracted first and third identifier codes". As previously explained, Call1 does not show or suggest use of a "database mapping" a "first identifier code" identifying "an object" to a "**second** identifier code identifying" the same "object" and similarly fails to suggest

"extracting...a corresponding **third** identifier code identifying **said object** from said received first message", and "generating" a "second message incorporating said extracted **first and third** identifier codes".

Amended dependent claim 10 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 9. Claim 10 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) "generating" a second message that incorporates "rules determining conduct of said search of said identifier code database" and the "rules are predetermined in an application used for accessing said database". Call1 does not show or suggest use of "rules determining conduct" of a "search of said identifier code database" in which the "rules are predetermined in an application used for accessing" a "database mapping" a "first identifier code" identifying "an object" to a "second identifier code identifying" the same "object". Call1 does not suggest use of such an identifier code database mapping a first code to a different second code identifying the **same object** and does not contemplate rules or their use in conducting a search of such a mapping database.

Dependent claim 12 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 12 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which an "identifier code mapping application and said database are co-located on the same processor, said processor comprising one of (a) a server, (b) a PC (c) a wireless device, (d) a mainframe computer and (e) another networked processing device". As previously explained, Call1 does not show or suggest use of a such a "mapping application" mapping a "first identifier code" identifying "an object" to a "**second** identifier code identifying" the same "object" or co-location of such a "mapping application and said database" on the "same processor".

Dependent claim 13 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 and because of the additional feature combination it includes.

Amended dependent claim 14 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 14 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) the method of claim 14 in which a "first message is received from an application initiating a transaction and including the step of, forwarding a **composite message** to a destination application in support of said transaction, said composite message being created including information derived from said first message and including said second identifier code". As previously

explained, Call1 does not show or suggest generation of a "**second** identifier code identifying" the same "object" and similarly fails to suggest "forwarding a **composite message** to a destination application in support of said transaction, said composite message being created including information derived from said first message and including said **second** identifier code".

Amended independent claim 15 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1. Claim 15 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) "generating a second message incorporating said extracted first identifier code... for initiating a search of a **remote** identifier code database mapping said first identifier code associated with said first entity to a corresponding second identifier code identifying said object...receiving said second identifier code corresponding to said first identifier code in response to communicating said second message for initiating a **search** of said **remote** identifier code database". As previously explained, Call1 does NOT suggest "search of a **remote** identifier code database mapping" a "first identifier code" identifying "an object" to a "**second** identifier code identifying" the **same** "object".

Amended independent claim 16 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1. Claim 16 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) a method for determining a specific identifier code for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes by a corresponding plurality of entities" involving "receiving a first message including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity; extracting said first identifier code from said received first message; generating a plurality of messages incorporating said extracted first identifier code, said plurality of messages being for initiating searches of a corresponding plurality of remote identifier code databases mapping said first identifier code associated with said first entity to a corresponding second identifier code identifying" the same "object"...receiving said second identifier code corresponding to said first identifier code in response to communicating said second message for initiating a search of said identifier code database". As previously explained, Call1 does NOT suggest "searches of a corresponding **plurality** of **remote** identifier code **databases mapping**" a "first identifier code" identifying "an object" to a "**second** identifier code identifying" the same "object". Call1 does not suggest search of such a database at all.

The claim 16 arrangement advantageously enables "a managing application such as the mapping application of server 60 or the interface application of server 62 (or applications in conjunction) to selectively initiate interrogation of multiple local or remote identifier code mapping databases. This enables a **distributed array of databases** to be selectively used at the option of a managing application for the transparent and seamless mapping of an identifier code associated with one entity (e.g., a requisitioning system) to a corresponding identifier code associated with a different entity (e.g., a materials management system) using Internet or other protocols. Further, the databases used for this purpose may be dynamically changed by the addition or removal of databases from an access list" (Application page 13 lines 10-20). Neither these advantages nor the features of the claim 16 arrangement that provide these advantages are suggested in Call1.

Amended independent claim 17 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1. Claim 17 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) "receiving from a remote source a first message...requesting determination of a specific identifier code for said object" and "providing said second identifier code to said remote source" in combination with "initiating a search of an identifier code database mapping said first identifier code... to a corresponding second identifier code identifying said object". As previously explained, Call1 does NOT suggest the claim 17 method for "providing a specific identifier code for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes by a corresponding plurality of entities". Call1 does not suggest search of a mapping database as recited in the claim 17 feature combination for the purpose of "providing said second identifier code" to a "remote source". The claim 17 arrangement "advantageously provides a centralized identifier code mapping database that alleviates the need to manually synchronize different identifier code mapping databases and files" (Application page 6 lines 17-19). The claim 17 features and the advantages that these features provide are nowhere suggested in Call1 which is concerned with the entirely different problem of transfer of "a request for information specified by an identifier, such as a product code, to a preferred source of that information, such as an Internet information resource devoted to the product specified by the product code which is created and maintained by the product's manufacturer" (Call1 column 1 lines 59-64).

Amended dependent claim 18 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 17. Claim 18 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 18 involving

"generating a record of said search and provision of said second identifier code for use in at least one of, (a) billing, and (b) creating a transaction record".

Amended independent claim 19 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claims 1-18. Claim 19 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) "augmenting" an "identifier code database" by "updating said database to incorporate additional corresponding codes from said received plurality of corresponding identifier codes identifying said object and provided by remote applications". As previously explained, Call1 does NOT suggest acquiring object identifier codes from multiple remote applications and mapping of the identifier codes identifying the same "object".

Amended dependent claim 20 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 19. Claim 20 is also considered to be patentable because Call1 does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 20 in which "an object comprises at least one of, (a) an article of manufacture, (b) a service and (c) a non-manufactured item and an entity comprises at least one of, (a) an object retailer, (b) an object wholesaler, (c) an object distributor, (d) an object manufacturer, (e) an object servicing enterprise and (f) an object seller". Consequently withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 10 and 12-20 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,418,441 – Call1 in view of U.S. Patent Application 20020161745 – Call2. These claims, as amended, are considered patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and for the following reasons.

Dependent claim 3 recites "said second message uses Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) for invoking" a "remote procedure for mapping said first identifier code to a corresponding second identifier code". These features are not shown or suggested in Call1 in combination with Call2.

The system of claim 3 generates "a second message incorporating said extracted first identifier code" for "initiating a search of an identifier code database mapping said first identifier code...to a corresponding second identifier code identifying said object" using "Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) for invoking"

a "remote procedure for mapping said first identifier code to a corresponding second identifier code". Neither Call1 nor Call2, individually or together, suggest such features. Call1 as recognized in the Rejection on page 10 does not disclose use of the SOAP protocol. Call2 discloses invoking "web services" using SOAP (Call2 paragraph 209). Further, in Call2 "Web service" refers to "a software application identified by a Universal Resource Identifier (URI), whose interfaces and binding are capable of being defined, described and discovered by XML artifacts and which supports direct interactions with other software applications using XML based messages via internet-based protocols" (Call2 paragraph 208). Consequently, a "web service" in Call2 (alone or with Call1) is NOT (and does not suggest) a "remote procedure for mapping said first identifier code to a corresponding second identifier code".

Neither Call1 nor Call2 discloses mapping a "first identifier code to a corresponding second identifier code" of the same "object" as previously explained. Also, neither Call1 nor Call2, individually or together, suggest generating "a second message incorporating said extracted first identifier code" for "initiating a search of an identifier code database mapping said first identifier code...to a corresponding second identifier code identifying said object" using "Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) for invoking" a "remote procedure for mapping said first identifier code to a corresponding second identifier code". Further, incorporating the features of Call2 in the system of Call1, as suggested in the Rejection, results in a system for invoking a "web service" involving "a software application identified by a Universal Resource Identifier (URI), whose interfaces and binding are capable of being defined, described and discovered by XML artifacts and which supports direct interactions with other software applications using XML based messages via internet-based protocols" to find an INTERNET ADDRESS of product information for a product. Such a combination fails to suggest. generating "a second message incorporating said extracted first identifier code" for "initiating a search of an identifier code database mapping said first identifier code...to a corresponding second identifier code identifying said object" using "Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) for invoking" a "remote procedure for mapping said first identifier code to a corresponding second identifier code". In addition, neither Call1 nor Call2 alone or together recognize, the problems involved in effecting commercial transactions that arise through attempted integration of disparate computer systems where a retailer, one or more distributors and a manufacturer employ different identifier codes for the same part, for example (Application page 1 lines 15-30). Neither Call1 nor Call2, alone or together, address alleviating "the need to manually synchronize different identifier code mapping

databases and files" (Application page 6 lines 17-19). Consequently, there is no motivation or other reason in Call1 or Call2 for combining features to produce the claimed system.

Dependent claim 11 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 for the reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 3. Consequently withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 11 under USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 5-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,418,441 – Call1 in view of U.S. Patent 6,055,516 – Johnson et al. These claims, as amended, are considered patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and for the following reasons.

Dependent claim 5 recites "said second message initiates a prioritized search of said database and an object comprises at least one of, (i) an article of manufacture, (ii) a service and (iii) a non-manufactured item and an entity comprises at least one of, (a) an object retailer, (b) an object wholesaler, (c) an object distributor, (d) an object manufacturer, (e) an object servicing enterprise and (f) an object seller". These features are not shown or suggested in Call1 in combination with Johnson.

The system of claim 5 generates "a second message incorporating said extracted first identifier code" for "initiating" a "**prioritized search**" of an identifier code database mapping said first identifier code...to a corresponding second identifier code identifying said object". Neither Call1 nor Johnson, individually or together, suggest such features. Call1, as recognized in the Rejection on page 11 does not disclose such a prioritized search. Johnson discloses a database "search priority...as follows: (1) part (catalog) number; (2) keyword; and (3) page number. The search will start with priority (1) and proceed through priority (3) in sequence until a search produces products matching the search criteria. At that time, the search will return the matching product information to requisition/purchasing system 40 and stop at the highest priority resulting in a match" (Johnson column 6 lines 19-27). Consequently, Johnson (alone or with Call1) does NOT suggest "**prioritized search**" of an identifier code database **mapping** said first identifier code...to a corresponding second identifier code identifying **said object**". Instead, Johnson discloses a prioritized

search of product information in a database of information on different products and **returns the "matching product information" NOT** a "corresponding second identifier code identifying **said object**".

Further, incorporating the features of Call1 in the system of Johnson as suggested in the Rejection results in a system for providing a prioritized search for product related information accessible at INTERNET ADDRESS derived from a database mapping a product code with an internet address. Such a combination fails to suggest a system for performing a "**prioritized search**" of an identifier code database **mapping** said first identifier code...to a corresponding second identifier code identifying **said object**". In addition, neither Call1 nor Johnson alone or together recognize, the problems involved in effecting commercial transactions that arise through attempted integration of disparate computer systems where a retailer, one or more distributors and a manufacturer employ different identifier codes for the same part, for example (Application page 1 lines 15-30). Neither Call1 nor Johnson, alone or together, address alleviating "the need to manually synchronize different identifier code mapping databases and files" (Application page 6 lines 17-19). Consequently, there is no motivation or other reason in Call1 with Johnson for combining features to produce the claimed system.

Dependent claim 6 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 5 for the reasons given in connection with claims 1, 3 and 5.

Dependent claim 8 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 7 for the reasons given in connection with claims 1, 3 and 5.

Dependent claim 9 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 and for the reasons given in connection with claims 1, 3, 5 and 10. Consequently withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 6, 8 and 9 under USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander J. Burke

Reg. No. 40,425

Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
Siemens Corporation,
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, N.J. 08830
Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. 1.8
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on 16 March 2004 **20____.**

Alexander J. Burke

16 March 2004
Date